

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/092,072	ROTHSCHILD, WAYNE H.	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** allowed

(1) Matthew D. Hoel, examiner.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Justin Swindells, attorney.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 11 January 2010

**Time:** P.M.

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*FR (04-21-2009).*

Claims discussed:

1-3,6-15,19,21-35,39-46,48-51,62-64,66-86.

Prior art documents discussed:

*Harkham (WO 01/91866 A1, PCT/US01/17285); Karmarkar (6,508,709 B1); Larose (2002/0087876 A1).*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/M. D. H./  
 Examiner, Art Unit 3714

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The applicant submitted an appeal brief 11-12-2009. The examiner discussed with SPEs Vo and Suhol that he believed the most relevant part of the specification (2003/0171149 A1) was Paras. 30 & 31 discussing enhanced and basic audiovisual features, depending on whether the wageror is located at or remotely from the casino. Atty. Justin Swindells discussed the possibility of putting dep. clm. 79 and corresponding limitations into the independent claims, and later e-mailed proposed amendments to this effect with authorization to enter them by examiner's amendment. The examiner subsequently called Mr. Swindells on 01-21-2010 to change the dependencies of claims 25, 26, 28 and 29 to depend from claim 10, as claims 24 and 27 had been cancelled by the proposed amendment. The claims are entered as submitted by the applicant except for the corrections to the dependencies of 25, 26, 28, and 29..